

REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 18, 2010. Claims 69-91 are presented for examination, of which Claims 69, 79 and 89 are in independent form. Claims 70-78, 81-88, 90 and 91 have been amended purely as to matters of form, and not to overcome any rejections or objections thereto. Claims 69, 79, 80 and 89 have been amended to define aspects of what Applicants regard as their invention more clearly. Support for the claim amendments may be found, for example, at page 106, lines 17-26, and in FIG. 72.¹ Favorable consideration is requested.

The Office Action objects to Claim 80 because of an informality in wording. In response, Applicants have amended Claim 80 to include the word “interface” as suggested in Section 1 of the Office Action. It is believed that the claim objection has been obviated, and therefore its withdrawal is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects Claims 69-71, 75-81, 83 and 85-89 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,552,813 (*Yacoub*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,467,434 (*Hower, Jr. et al.*); and rejects Claims 72, 82, 90 and 91 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yacoub* in view of *Hower, Jr. et al.*², and further in view of European Patent Application Publication No. 0 529 692 (*Murakami*). For at least the following reasons, Applicants submit that independent Claims 69, 79 and 89, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art.

¹ Any examples presented herein are intended for illustrative purposes and are not to be construed to limit the scope of the claims.

² The Office Action states that Claims 72, 82, 90, and 91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yacoub* in view of *Aliello, Jr. et al.* as applied to Claim 69, and further in view of *Murakami*. Applicants believe that the Office Action intended to reject Claims 72, 82, 90, and 91 in view of a combination of *Yacoub*, *Hower, Jr. et al.* (not *Aliello, Jr. et al.*), and *Murakami*.

Claim 69 is directed an information processing apparatus for controlling, via a communication medium, a peripheral that processes a job and executes a predetermined service. The information processing apparatus includes an obtaining unit, a display unit, a first discrimination unit, an issuance unit, an inhibition unit, and a transmission unit.

The obtaining unit obtains, via the communication medium, function information indicating plural values executable by the peripheral. Based on the function information obtained by the obtaining unit, the display unit displays a user interface provided in a control program for controlling the peripheral.

Notably, the first discrimination unit discriminates whether the peripheral supports a function of reading and processing data using reference pointers. When the first discrimination unit discriminates that the peripheral supports the function of reading and processing data using reference pointers, the issuance unit issues a job provided with (i) plural setting values set via the user interface displayed by the display unit, the plural setting values including a value of a first attribute and a value of a second attribute different from the first attribute, and (ii) a reference pointer indicating a reference to data to be processed using the plural setting values. The issuance unit issues the job provided with the reference pointer indicating the reference to data in an external apparatus, without downloading the data to the information processing apparatus. If the plural setting values of the job are determined not to satisfy a predetermined condition related to the plural values indicated by the function information obtained by the obtaining unit, the inhibition unit inhibits issuance of the job by the issuance unit. If setting of the value of the first attribute inhibits setting of the value of the second attribute, the inhibition unit determines that the job does not satisfy the predetermined condition related to the plural setting values. The transmission unit transmits the job, the plural

setting values, and the reference pointer issued by the issuance unit to the peripheral directly via the communication medium.

Yacoub is understood to relate to a virtual printer for print jobs printed on networked printers (*see* Abstract). In *Yacoub*, options for speed and quality can be presented by a client station for selection by a user, and a server can find appropriate printers for selected speed and quality options, without the user making a selection (*see* col. 5, lines 22-27). Because the server is understood to relay print job information from client station to the printers, nothing has been found in *Yacoub* that is believed to teach or suggest that the client station transmits print job information *directly* to a peripheral, such as a printer deemed to be appropriate by the server. Additionally, nothing has been found in *Yacoub* that is believed to teach or suggest that the client station discriminates whether a peripheral supports a function of reading and processing data using reference pointers. Moreover, Applicants agree with the Office Action's conclusion that *Yacoub* fails to disclose an issuance unit that issues a job and a reference pointer indicating a reference to data to be processed using plural setting values (*see* Office Action, page 4).

Hower, Jr. et al. is understood to relate to a technique for determining whether a combination of print job selections is available at a printer having a predetermined set of printer properties (*see* col. 1, lines 7-11). In *Hower, Jr. et al.*, a client device includes an electronic job ticket that permits a user to program a print job for transmission to a server device (*see* col. 4, lines 2-5). The job ticket contains programming parameters for the job, such as a quantity parameter, a plex parameter, an enlargement parameter, a reduction parameter, a stock parameter, and a finishing parameter (*see* col. 4, lines 57). Nothing has been found in *Hower, Jr. et al.* that is believed to teach or suggest that the job ticket includes a reference pointer that refers

to data in an external apparatus. Additionally, nothing has been found in *Yacoub* that is believed to teach or suggest that the client device discriminates whether a peripheral supports a function of reading and processing data using reference pointers. Moreover, the client device is understood to communicate directly only with the server device; the client device is not understood to communicate directly with a printer. Accordingly, nothing has been found in *Hower, Jr. et al.* that is believed to teach or suggest that client device transmits print job information *directly* to a peripheral, such as a printer.

In summary, Applicants submit that a combination of *Yacoub* and *Hower, Jr. et al.*, assuming such combination would even be permissible, would fail to teach or suggest an information processing apparatus that includes a “first discrimination unit adapted to discriminate whether the peripheral supports a function of reading and processing data using reference pointers,” an “issuance unit adapted to issue a job provided with (i) plural setting values set via the user interface displayed by the display unit, the plural setting values including a value of a first attribute and a value of a second attribute different from the first attribute, and (ii) a reference pointer indicating a reference to data to be processed using the plural setting values, when the first discrimination unit discriminates that the peripheral supports the function of reading and processing data using reference pointers,” wherein “the issuance unit issues the job provided with the reference pointer indicating the reference to data in an external apparatus, without downloading the data to the information processing apparatus,” and a “transmission unit adapted to transmit the job, provided with the plural setting values and the reference pointer, issued by the issuance unit to the peripheral directly via the communication medium,” as recited in Claim 69. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 69 is patentable over the cited art, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Independent Claims 79 and 89 include features sufficiently similar to those of Claim 69 that these claims are believed to be patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. The other rejected claims in the present application depend from one or another of independent Claims 69 and 79 and are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, individual consideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and an early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/
Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200